to objects and these can be good or evil; but it might
still be held that this does not affect the neutrality
of the object which does not act by an individualised
consciousness but only as it is utilised for good or
for evil or for both together: the duality of good
and evil is not native to the material principle,.
it is absent from the world of Matter.
The duality begins with conscious life and
emerges fully with the development of mind in
life; the vital mind, the mind of desire and
sensation, is the creator of the sense of evil and of
the fact of evil. Moreover, in animal life, the fact
of evil is there, the evil of suffering and the sense
of suffering, the evil of violence and cruelty and
strife and deception, but the sense of moral evil is
absent; in animal life there is no duality of sin or
virtue, all action is neutral and permissible for the
preservation of life and its maintenance and for the
satisfaction of the life-instincts. The sensational
values of good and evil are inherent in the form of
pain and pleasure, vital satisfaction and vital
frustration, but the mental idea, the moral response
of the mind to these values are a creation of the
human being. It does not follow, as might be

hastily inferred, that they are unrealities, mental
constructions only, and that the only true way to
receive the activities of Nature is either a neutral
indifference or an equal acceptance or, intellectually,
an admission of all that she may do as a divine or a
natural law in which everything is impartially
admissible. That is indeed one side of the truth: